REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on June 26, 2008, and the references cited therewith. No claims are amended, canceled, or added; as a result, claims 6-30 are now pending in this application.

35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 6-13,15,17-24,27 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040250046) in view of Ostman et al.(U.S. Patent No.6483838). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented because the combination of references fail to teach the claimed invention.

The Ostman reference

The Ostman reference describes "a demultiplexer function which demultiplexes an ATM cell with AAL2 protocol into outgoing ATM cells of the second type AAL protocol". See column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 1. Ostman also describes an "overlap" condition in which "the payload of the incoming ATM cell begins with a portion of a packet which bridged this incoming ATM cell and a previous ATM cell." See column 33, lines 30-34. Accordingly, the "overlap" of Ostman describes a situation in which a single packet spans ATM cell boundaries. Ostman describes multiplexing packets into ATM cells in cases that result in packets spanning (overlapping) the ATM cell boundaries. See Figures 14D and 14H; column 35, lines 10-19. Ostman also describes demultiplexing packets from ATM cells in cases where packets span (overlap) the ATM cell boundaries. See Figures 13F and 13H; column 22, line 60 to column 23, line 35.

The use of the term "overlap" in Ostman is not consistent with the use of the term "overlap" in the claimed invention. Whereas Ostman uses the term "overlap" to describe a packet crossing an ATM cell boundary, the instant application uses the term "overlap" to describe "overlapping data segments that are not mutually exclusive". See page 7, line 12, and Figure 3 of the application as filed. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Ostman's

ATM-cell-boundary-spanning-packets fail to teach the overlapping data segments of the claimed invention.

Regarding independent claims 6, 9, 17, 20, and 27, the office action alleges that Figure 13F, col. 22, lines 8-23 of Ostman show "overlapping segments." Applicants respectfully disagree. As described above, the cited portion of Ostman describes a situation where a packet spans (overlaps) ATM cell boundaries.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach "configuring at least one programmable element to demultiplex the data stream into overlapping segments" as recited in claim 6; "demultiplex a packet-based input data stream into a plurality of separate overlapping data streams" as recited in claim 9; "demultiplex a packet-based data stream into a plurality of overlapping data streams" as recited in claim 17; and "processing elements ... configurable to operate on a plurality of overlapping data sub-streams in parallel" as recited in claims 20 and 27.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented with respect to the independent claims. Applicants believe the independent claims are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 7, 8, 10-13, 15, 18, 19, 21-24, and 30 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claims 14,16 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040250046) in view of Agee et al.(U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040095907). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented because the combination of references fails to teach the claimed invention. The rejection of dependent claims 14, 16, and 29 relies on the above rejection of the independent claims. Applicants have traversed the rejection of the independent claims and submit that the independent claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants further submit that claims 14, 16, and 29 are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040250046) in view of Ostman et al.(U.S. Patent

No. 6483838) and in view of Snyder (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20050138323). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented because the combination of references fails to teach the claimed invention. The rejection of dependent claims 25 and 26 relies on the above rejection of the independent claims. Applicants have traversed the rejection of the independent claims and submit that the independent claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants further submit that claims 25 and 26 are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (952-473-8800) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

HOOMAN HONARY ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number: 45445

Telephone Number: 952-473-8800

Date September 26, 2008

By /Dana B. LeMoine/
Dana B. LeMoine
Reg. No. 40,062